1	
^	

3

4

5 6

7

8 9

10

11

12 13

14

15

16 17

18

19

20 21

22

23

24 25

26

27

28

- preserving all applicable privileges, I declare that I directed my attorneys (the law firm of Del Mar Law Group, LLP) to dismiss the LEVINE CASE because I became uncomfortable with serving as the class representative.
- 3. As an initial matter, the law firm of Gordon & Rees, LLP (the law firm representing defendant BIC USA, Inc. in the above-captioned action and the LEVINE CASE) is known to me. Gordon & Rees, LLP was my former law firm, which represented me in the arbitration matter captioned as <u>Levine v. All Commercial Insurance Services</u>, <u>Inc.</u>
- 4. As a result of the favorable ruling obtained in the Levine v. All Commercial Insurance Services, Inc. case, I developed a friendship with Gordon & Rees, LLP attorneys that included traveling to Hawaii with a Gordon & Rees, LLP attorney is who currently a partner at the firm to celebrate the favorable arbitration ruling.
- 5. During the course of litigating the LEVINE CASE, I began to understand the zealous nature in which defense law firms attack the credibility of purported class action representatives. Furthermore, I reviewed several motions filed by Gordon & Rees, LLP in the LEVINE CASE which supported this understanding.
- 6. Rather than going through the lengthy process of having my relationship with both Gordon & Rees, LLP and Del Mar Law Group, LLP scrutinized and/or compromised, I concluded that I was no longer comfortable in serving as the class representative in the LEVINE CASE.
- 7. Therefore, on or about November 1, 2007, I directed Del Mar Law Group, LLP to dismiss the LEVINE CASE.
- 8. I understand that it would have been permissible to substitute a class representative for myself in the LEVINE CASE; however, I am uncomfortable with having my name listed on the pleading caption in perpetuity, including potential appeals that could last several years.
- 9. At all relevant times, I was informed and believe and continue to believe that the BIC disposable lighters do not qualify for the "Made in the USA" labeling. My prosecution of the LEVINE CASE was at all times with good faith and with the understanding that I would

Cas	e 3:07-cv-02367-LAB-RBB Document 15-3 Filed 01/09/2008 Page 3 of 3
1	eventually force BIC to change their unlawful advertising practices. I am still informed that the
2	component parts that constitute the entirety of the Maxi BIC disposable lighter is made from
3	foreign-sourced components. Therefore, the BIC disposable lighter does not qualify for "Made
4	in the USA" labeling pursuant to my understanding of California law.
5	I declare under penalty of perjury pursuant to the laws of California and the United States
6	of America, that the foregoing is true and correct and that this declaration was executed on
7	January <u>9</u> , 2008, at Del Mar, California.
8 9	_ land
10	Kevin T. Levine
11	
12	
13	
14	
15	
16	
17	
18	
19	
20	
21	
22	
23	
24	
25	
26	
27	
28	